

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 12, 14-16 and 23-29 are pending and under consideration.
Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

PAGE 5: ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1, 3-8, 23-25, and 29 are allowed. Applicant appreciates the indications of allowable subject matter.

PAGES 4-5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12, 14-16 AND 26-28 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KIKUCHI ET AL. (U.S.P. 5,584,022) IN VIEW OF DAVIS ET AL. (U.S.P. 5,918,229)

The Examiner rejects claims 12, 14-16 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikuchi in view of Davis. The rejections are traversed.

Independent claim 12 recites an information processing apparatus including "a directory structure, in the computer-readable storage, comprising a plurality of directories corresponding to the plurality of applications independently of whether a directory in the directory structure is a subordinate directory or a highest directory, wherein, in the computer-readable storage, information of the application addresses are given directly to the directories of the directory structure, respectively, the application address information identifying the applications, respectively, where the applications are needed for corresponding data files, and where the data files are organized and stored in the computer-readable storage using the directories of the directory structure, wherein one of the plurality of applications is needed when one of the data files is selected."

Applicant submits that features recited by independent claim 12 (and dependent claims) are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination. As recited by independent claim 12:

- 1) "information of the application addresses are given directly to the directories,"
- 2) "the applications are needed for corresponding data files," and
- 3) "the data files are organized and stored in the computer-readable storage using the directories of the directory structure." (Emphasis added).

To the contrary, Kikuchi (as disclosed in col. 9, lines 15-22 and cited by the Examiner) merely teaches:

[T]he directory structure unit 31 is written with the storage location addresses of each of the enciphered files.

(Emphasis added.)

Further, Kikuchi (as disclosed in col. 3, lines 35-39 and cited by the Examiner) teaches

that "(e)ach file is stored in one of directories," and (col. 3, lines 54-67) teaches that "the directory IDn stores the cipher keys."

However, according to Kikuchi (see, col. 3, lines 48-53):

[T]he files F11 and F12 are both enciphered by the cipher key K1.

(Emphasis added).

That is, Kikuchi, alone or in combination, does not teach an application address is given to the directory as recited by independent claim 12 according to the present invention. Rather, Applicant submits that according to the teachings of Kikuchi, merely the location addresses of the enciphered files and cipher key enciphering these files, are stored in the directories.

I. Assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner considers that the files F11, F12 of Kikuchi correspond to the "data files" as recited by claim 12 of the present invention, then it follows that the cipher key K1 of Kikuchi should correspond to the "applications" as recited by claim 12 of the present invention.

However, in this *arguendo* case, according to Kikuchi, the cipher key, itself, and not a location address thereof is stored in the directory.

II. On the other hand, assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner considers that the files F11, F12 of Kikuchi correspond to the "applications" as recited by claim 12 of the present invention, then it would follow that the cipher key K1 of Kikuchi should correspond to the "data file" as recited by claim 12 of the present invention.

However, based on this assumption, since, according to the recitations of the claim 12 of present invention, the "application" is needed for a corresponding "data file," it would follow that the files F11, F12 disclosed should be needed for the cipher key K1, which is not the case.

That is, Kikuchi, alone or in combination, does not teach an application address is given to the directory as recited by independent claim 12 according to the present invention.

Summary

Since features recited by independent claim 12 (and dependent claims 14-16 and 26-28) are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination, and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 12, 14-16 and 26-28 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 12, 2006

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501